

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

ROBERT NEEDHAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case Number 04-10149-BC  
Honorable David M. Lawson

THE ROHO GROUP,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DISMISSING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL**

On August 1, 2005, the defendant filed a motion to compel the plaintiff to produce certain evidence. E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(a) requires a movant to seek concurrence in the relief requested before filing a motion with this Court. If concurrence is obtained, the parties then may present a stipulated order to the Court. If concurrence is not obtained, Local Rule 7.1(a)(2) requires that the moving party state in the motion that "there was a conference between the attorneys . . . in which the movant explained the nature of the motion and its legal basis and requested but did not obtain concurrence in the relief sought [ ] or . . . despite reasonable efforts specified in the motion, the movant was unable to conduct a conference." E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(a)(2).

The defendant does not state in its motion that concurrence was sought in the relief requested from the plaintiff before filing the motion, and the plaintiff's response indicates concurrence was not sought. "It is not up to the Court to expend its energies when the parties have not sufficiently expended their own." *Hasbro, Inc. v. Serafino*, 168 F.R.D. 99, 101 (D. Mass. 1996). The defendant has filed its motion in violation of the applicable rules.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the defendant's motion [dkt # 63] is **DISMISSED**.

s/David M. Lawson

DAVID M. LAWSON

United States District Judge

Dated: September 14, 2005

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first class U.S. mail on September 14, 2005

s/Tracy A. Jacobs

TRACY A. JACOBS